

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/052,908	10/29/2001	Waheguru Pal Singh	LYNN/120.A	LYNN/120.A 9750	
7	590 07/24/2003				
Jeffrey L. Streets			EXAMINER		
STREETS & STEELE 13831 Northwest Fwy., Ste. 355			QAZI, SABI	QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
Houston, TX	77040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616	12	
			DATE MAILED: 07/24/2003	10	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/052,908	SINGH ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Sabiha Qazi	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover shet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverset, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. § 36(a) and the appropriat	See MPEP e extension fee
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or	(2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): See Continuation Sheet		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-37,40-42 and 44</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Exan	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		503	
		BIHA QAZI, PH.D MARY EXAMINER	

Continuation Sh t (PTO-303) 110/052,998 Application No.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Since the claims are amended, 112 (1) and (2) rejection are withdrawn.

Continuation of 10. Other: Rejection under 103 is maintained because compositions as claimed are considered obvious for the same reason as set forth in our previous office action. It would have been obvious to prepare additional beneficial compositions as disclosed by the prior art. Even if prior does not teach use for sterilization of the composition, the two different intended uses are not distinguishable in terms of the composition, see In re Thuau, 57 USPQ 324; Ex parte Douros, 163 USPQ 667; and In re Craige, 89 USPQ 393. There is nothing inventive in a composition of old ingradients of known properties with each ingradient individually as expected. In re Sussaman. 58 USPQ 262...